# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/772,320 | 01/25/2001 | Anoop Gupta | MS1-674US | 7680 |

| 45979　　7590　　01/11/2006 | | EXAMINER |
|---|---|---|
| PERKINS COIE LLP/MSFT | | CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q |
| P. O. BOX 1247 | | |

| | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|---|
| SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247 | 2145 | |

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 09/772,320 | ANOOP GUPTA, ET AL |
| ***Office Action Summary*** | Examiner | Art Unit |
|  | Azizul Choudhury | 2145 |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 October 2005_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.    2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-6,9-15,18 and 77-82_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-6,9-15,18 and 77-82_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _25 January 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All  b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

## *Detailed Action*

This office action is in response to the correspondence received on October 21, 2005.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 9-15, 18 and 77-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Chandhok et al (US Pat No: US006662212B1) in view of Hanson et

al (US Pat No: US006463461B1), hereafter referred to as Chandhok and Hanson,

respectively.

1.      With regards to claims 1 and 79, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method

performed by a computer system for handling collaborative electronic mail messages,

comprising: receiving from an electronic mail server an indication of an electronic mail

message (column 2, lines 34-39 and column 4, lines 6-16, Chandhok); accepting a

command made available by an electronic mail program for manipulating electronic mail

messages (column 3, lines 10-19, Chandhok); determining whether the indicated

electronic mail message is a collaborative electronic mail message (Workgroup shared

files are collaborative files, column 2, lines 49-53 and column 4, lines 16-26, Chandhok);

and when the indicated electronic mail message is a collaborative electronic mail

message, performing the command, the performing including sending to the electronic

mail server an indication of the command so that the electronic mail server can modify

the collaborative electronic mail message in accordance with the command and notify

recipients of the modification, thereby performing a different action for the command

than the electronic mail server performs when the indicated electronic mail message is

not a collaborative electronic mail message (column 2, lines 34-53 and column 3, lines

10-19 and column 4, lines 16-26, Chandhok).

(In the same field of endeavor, Hanson teaches a design enabling users to

communicate and collaborate among a group of participants (column 2, line 24 –

column 3, line 34, Hanson). The design allows for a server to provide the collaborative

messages (Figure 1, Hanson). The design also allows the messages to be emails

(column 2, line 56, Hanson). Finally, Hanson's design has the server attached to the

client machines through a network (Figure 1, Hanson). Each client has it's own

software interface by which to communicate to the server with via commands (column 2,

lines 44-51, Hanson). In software interfaces, it is inherent that when a user enters data

and makes a request in the software, the request along with the data is converted to a

command, which is sent to the server. The software interfaces translates the

commands by which the client and server communicate with one another, into data that

is understandable by the user.

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the

invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to

provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of

participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).


2.      With regards to claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 80 and 82, Chandhok teaches through Hanson,

a method wherein the commands to manipulate the collaborative electronic mail

message include reply, forward, delete and flag commands

        (Chandhok's design allows for standard email commands (column 3, lines 10-19,

Chandhok).

        In the same field of endeavor, Hanson's disclosure teaches a collaborative

messaging system that uses email (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson) and

hence standard email commands are used.

        Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the

invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to

provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of

participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).


3.      With regards to claim 6, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method wherein

the indication comprises the collaborative electronic mail message

        (Indication means are present within Chandhok's design (column 5, lines 55-66,

Chandhok).

In the same field of endeavor, Hanson's design has indications comprised within collaborative emails (column 11, lines 32-42, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

4.     With regards to claim 9, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method wherein the collaborative electronic mail message further includes a graph of responses to the collaborative electronic mail message

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-56, Chandhok).

In the same field of endeavor, Hanson's design allows for dynamic portions to exist within the message/email.  The dynamic portion allows for graphs/charts (Figure 4, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

5.      With regards to claim 10, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method further

comprising: receiving a user selection of a portion of the graph; and indicating which of

a plurality of comments in the portion for feedback correspond to the selected portion of

the graph

        (Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-

56, Chandhok).

        In the same field of endeavor, Hanson's design allows for dynamic portions to

exist within the message/email.  The dynamic portion allows for graphs/charts (Figure 4,

Hanson).  It also allows for user interaction.

        Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the

invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to

provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of

participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).


6.      With regards to claim 11, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method wherein

the user selection comprises positioning of a cursor over the portion of the graph

        (Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-

56, Chandhok).

        In the same field of endeavor, Hanson's design allows for messages/emails to

have dynamic portions to them.  This includes charts/graphs and user interaction

portions (Figure 4, Hanson).  In a design that allows for the use of computers with

interface tools such as a keyboard and mouse (column 5, lines 39-44, Hanson) and allows for dynamic portions where users are able to make the changes in a message and have all other affiliated messages updated as well (column 2, lines 23-34, Hanson), it is inherent that the cursor feature claimed is present within Hanson's design.

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).


7.     With regards to claim 12, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method wherein the portion of the graph comprises a bar of a bar graph

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-56, Chandhok).

In the same field of endeavor, Hanson's design allows for graphical images such as charts to be present (Figure 4, Hanson) (column 10, lines 45-56, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

8.    With regards to claim 13, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method further

comprising:  receiving a user selection of a portion of the graph; and indicating which of

the one or more recipients corresponds to the portion of the graph

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-

56, Chandhok).

In the same field of endeavor, Hanson's design allows for dynamic portions

allowing for user input (Figure 4, Hanson), which by inputting updates the corresponding

messages (column 2, lines 23-34, Hanson).  Hanson's design allows for a wide array of

dynamic input including forms and polls as well as charts (column 10, lies 45-67,

Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the

invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to

provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of

participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).


9.    With regards to claim 14, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method wherein

a recipient corresponds to the portion of the graph if the recipient's response to the

collaborative electronic mail message is reflected in the portion

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-

56, Chandhok).

In the same field of endeavor, Hanson's design allows for responses to be made and they are updated to the corresponding messages (column 2, lines 23-51, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).


10.   With regards to claim 15, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method wherein indicating which of the one or more recipients corresponds to the portion of the graph comprises displaying which of the one or more recipients corresponds to the portion in a box separate from the collaborative electronic mail message

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-56, Chandhok).

In the same field of endeavor, Hanson's design allows for separate portions of the message/email (Figure 4, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

11.     With regards to claim 18, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method further

comprising:  changing the identifier when the collaborative electronic mail message is

opened by the user; receiving an indication that the collaborative electronic mail

message has been modified; and changing the identifier again to visually indicate that

the collaborative electronic mail message has been modified

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing users to share work (column 2, lines 49-

56, Chandhok).

In the same field of endeavor, Hanson's design allows for messages/emails to be

updated when the message is opened to display the current information since some

information is dynamic (column 4, lines 21-45, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the

invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to

provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of

participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

12.     With regards to claim 77, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method as

recited in claim 1 wherein when the indicated electronic mail message is not a

collaborative electronic mail message; the performing includes sending to the electronic

mail server an indication of the command so that the electronic mail server can handle

the electronic mail message in accordance with the command

(Chandhok teaches a design allowing regular emails to be handled (column 2, lines 34-39, Chandhok).

In the same field of endeavor, Hanson's disclosure teaches a collaborative messaging system that uses email (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

13.     With regards to claim 78, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a method as recited in claim 1 further comprising enabling the command to be used with both collaborative electronic mail messages and non-collaborative electronic mail messages even when different actions will be taken based on whether the electronic mail message is a collaborative electronic mail message

(Chandhok teaches a design that is able to handle regular emails and shared file (collaborative) emails (column 2, lines 34-53 and column 3, lines 10-19, Chandhok).

In the same field of endeavor, Hanson's disclosure teaches a collaborative messaging system that uses email (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to

provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of

participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).


14.     With regards to claim 81, Chandhok teaches through Hanson, a system for

handling collaborative electronic mail messages, comprising:  an electronic mail client

program providing a set of commands, the commands for manipulating electronic mail

messages (All elements are present within Chandhok's design (column 2, lines 26-39,

Chandhok); an electronic mail server program that provides indications of electronic

mail messages to the electronic mail client program, receives a command from the

electronic mail client program in relation to an electronic mail message, and takes an

appropriate action for the received command depending on whether the electronic mail

message is a collaborative electronic mail message (Means for using the same

commands for different email types are provided (column 2, lines 26-56 and column 3,

lines 10-19 and column 4, lines 16-26, Chandhok).

In the same field of endeavor, Hanson's disclosure teaches a collaborative

messaging system that uses email (column 2, line 24 – column 3, line 34, Hanson).

Both Chandhok and Hanson teach collaborative designs making use of emails.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the

invention, to have combined the teachings of Chandhok with those of Hanson, to

provide a system for communicating information or collaborating among a group of

participants in a group (column 2, lines 24-26, Hanson)).

## *Remarks*

The amendment received October 21, 2005 has been carefully examined but is not deemed fully persuasive. While the new claims and amendments have helped in advancing the case, further search has yielded a new prior art. It is believed that the Chandhok prior art teaches the means by which to use one set of commands to control regular emails as well as shared file (collaborative) emails.

## *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Azizul Choudhury whose telephone number is (571) 272-3909. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AC

JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER